

DJG

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Thursday, February 11, 1982  
6:26 o'clock p.m.

Ninth Floor Auditorium  
PEPCO Building  
10th and E Streets, N.W.  
Washington, D.C.

Presiding:

Mrs. Lillian J. Huff

C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1982</u>	
Call to Order and Roll Call.....	4
Approval of Minutes as Corrected.....	11
Motion Carried to Adopt Rule 3.2.....	19
Motion to Adopt Rule 3.3.....	20
Simmons Amendment.....	21
Schrag Amendment to Amendment Carried.....	26
Simmons-Schrag Amendment Carried.....	41
Motion Carried to Delete Sentence from Rule 3.3.....	43
Motion Carried to Adopt Rule 3.3 as Amended.....	50
Motion Carried to Adopt Rule 3.4.....	64
Motion Carried to Nominate Presidential Candidates First.....	69
Nominations of Presidential Candidates.....	69
Seconding Speeches.....	72
Candidates' Speeches.....	74
Roll Call Vote.....	79
Election of First Vice President	
Nomination.....	84
Seconding Speech.....	85
Motion Carried to Cast Unanimous Vote.....	86
Election of Second Vice President	
Nominations.....	86
Candidates' Speeches.....	89
Seconding Speeches.....	91
Roll Call Vote.....	95
Motion Carried to Conduct a Second Roll Call Vote.....	103
Motion Carried to Place Names on Blackboard of Those Who Pass.....	105
Second Roll Call Vote.....	105
Motion Carried to Reopen Nominations to Office of Second Vice President.....	111
Nominations.....	111
Seconding Speeches.....	113
Roll Call Vote.....	117
Election of Third Vice President	
Nominations.....	124
Seconding Speeches.....	128
Roll Call Vote.....	131
Election of Secretary	

[Contents continued on  
page following.]



Contents, Cont'd.

	<u>PAGE</u>
Election of Secretary	
Nomination.....	137
Seconds.....	137
Motion Carried to Cast Unanimous Vote.....	139
Election of Assistant Secretary	
Nominations.....	139
Seconding Speeches.....	141
Candidates' Speeches.....	144
Roll Call Vote.....	145
Second Roll Call Vote.....	151
Election of Treasurer	
Nomination.....	156
Motion Carried to Close Nomination.....	157
Motion Carried to Cast Unanimous Vote.....	158
Election of Historian	
Nomination.....	158
Motion Carried to Close Nomination.....	159
Motion Carried to Cast Unanimous Vote.....	160
Motion Carried to Thank Volunteers.....	163
Motion Carried to Meet in Public Service	
Commission Building on 2/13/82.....	167
Motion Carried to Adjourn.....	167

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Will the delegates please come to order. We have a quorum. We will have the secretary call the roll.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Baldwin.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Barnes. [No response]  
Delegate Blount.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Bruning.

DELEGATE BRUNING: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Clarke. [No response]  
Delegate Coates. [No response]

Delegate Cooper. Present.

Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Croft. [No response]  
Delegate Eichhorn.

DELEGATE EICHORN: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Feely.

DELEGATE FEELY: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Freeman. [No response]

Delegate Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Graham. [No response]

Delegate Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Holmes. [No response]

Delegate Jackson.

DELEGATE JACKSON: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jones.

DELEGATE JONES: Oh, present.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jordan. [No response]

Delegate Kameny. [No response]

Delegate Lockridge.

DELEGATE LOCKRIDGE: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Long. [No response]

Delegate Love. [No response]

Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Marcus.

DELEGATE MARCUS: Good evening.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Charles Mason.

DELEGATE C. MASON: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Hilda Mason.

DELEGATE H. MASON: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Brian Moore. [No response]

Delegate Jerry Moore. [No response]

Delegate Nahikian. [No response]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Talmadge Moore.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Talmadge Moore. [No response]

Delegate Nixon.

DELEGATE NIXON: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Oulahan.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Paramore. [No response]

Delegate Robinson.. [No response]

Delegate Rothschild. [No response]

Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Shelton. [No response]

Delegate Simmons. [No response]

Delegate Street.

DELEGATE STREET: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Terrell. [No response]  
Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Warren. [No response]  
Delegate Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: Here. I said here before.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Long.

DELEGATE LONG: Here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Holmes.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: She's here.

DELEGATE HOLMES: I'm here.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Shelton.

DELEGATE SHELTON: Present.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: May I have your attention, please.  
There are 28 members of the delegation that have answered  
the roll call, which means we have a quorum. Did everyone  
get a set of minutes?

I would like for you to read the minutes so that  
we can move on.

DELEGATE JORDAN: I missed the roll call.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We've got you present.

SECRETARY COOPER: He was on official business Xeroxing. Twenty-eight.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Did you get a set of minutes? There should be a set in front of your chair.

Croft is joining.

SECRETARY COOPER: Croft.

[Pause for late arrivals to be seated.]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Paramore, Rothschild, Talmadge Moore.

Did everybody read your minutes?

Those don't amplify. They are just for recording purposes. We don't have anything to amplify. We requested some, but we don't--so, you have to speak up. Ms. Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: I would like to move the adoption of the minutes of February 9, '82.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Do I hear a second?

DELEGATE BALDWIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly seconded by Ms. Sandra Johnson--a motion made by Ms. Johnson to adopt the minutes with the necessary correction, and seconded by Mr. Baldwin. Are there any corrections?

Mr. Baldwin.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: On page 2, Madame Chairperson,

amendment by Delegate Baldwin to the second sentence to read: All proposals shall be filed--I am going to read it as it was stated. All proposals shall be filed with the president and be made an agenda item for the convention slash executive committee.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Oh, you didn't want the slash executive committee right after president?

DELEGATE BALDWIN: No, no, after convention. In other words, it would be an agenda item either with the executive committee or the convention, either-or.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay. Okay.

Are there any other corrections?

DELEGATE HARRIS: Yes, there are.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Page 3, the top of the page: Motion by Delegate Harris to table. The motion was to table the report of the public information and submission in order to establish guidelines for that committee to be reconsidered in the immediate future.

SECRETARY COOPER: The amendment is being tabled at the bottom of page 2.

DELEGATE HARRIS: What? The amendment is what?

SECRETARY COOPER: The motion and the amendment

is being tabled at the bottom of page 2.

DELEGATE HARRIS: No--amendment by Delegate Long, that's something else. The motion--you have: motion by Delegate Moore to establish the committee.

SECRETARY COOPER: Yes.

DELEGATE HARRIS: And amendment that the substance of the minority report become the charge of such a committee.

SECRETARY COOPER: Yes.

DELEGATE HARRIS: But my motion--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Was to table that--

DELEGATE HARRIS: --was to table the report of the committee in order that the committee establish guidelines, specific guidelines, and that that report be reconsidered in the immediate future.

Do you have it or should I write it for you?

SECRETARY COOPER: Not in writing.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Would you put it in writing, please, so we get it just like you made it.

Ms. Street.

DELEGATE STREET: Page 2, about the seventh or eighth line, amendment by Delegate Street to state that the president must render public notification one week prior to consideration of any proposal by committee. My motion



spoke to public hearings, not to proposals to be considered by committees. The motion was lost, but the idea was to give one week's notification for any public hearing relating to a proposal.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Do you have that, Mr. Cooper?

SECRETARY COOPER: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Are there any other corrections? Are there any other corrections on the minutes? Are there any other corrections?

Hearing none, let's vote on the approval of the minutes with the necessary corrections. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Any abstentions? [No abstentions]

Okay, the motion carried, and the minutes are accepted with the necessary correction.

Ms. Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: I would like to say good evening to all the delegates. I hope you all had a good day because I had a rough one.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: May I have your attention, please, so that we can move right along?

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I would like to

make a motion to adopt Rule 3.3 with all the corrections and amendments if there be any.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Is there a second?

DELEGATE KAMENY: We did not finish 3.2.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, we did.

DELEGATE KAMENY: No, we didn't. We didn't adopt it, and we were in the middle of discussion of it.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We most certainly did. We completed 3.2. We are now starting on 3.3.

Did you put a motion on the floor? Did I hear a second?

A DELEGATE: Second.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Yes, there is a second over there.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: So that it's before the house, okay.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: Point of information. Point of information, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Barbara Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: I can't find in the minutes where it said that we adopted Rule 3.2.

DELEGATE KAMENY: We did not.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: On page 3 of your minutes, Mr. Secretary, that tells you what happened.

[Pause for the chairman and the secretary to confer.]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Kameny, you may have the floor.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Madam Chair, I know we didn't adopt 3.2 because I had another amendment and I was waiting for the proper time and it never arrived last time. Therefore, I would like to propose an amendment now to 3.2 if it's in order.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We passed 3.2, but go back.

DELEGATE KAMENY: No.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, we did. I make notes when we do this.

DELEGATE KAMENY: But I was waiting for amendments to be worked through so I could make mine in proper time.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Holmes, would you withdraw your motion about 3.3 and go back to 3.2?

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I will withdraw my motion to adopt 3.3, and we will go back to Rule 3.2.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: And before you do that, I would like the secretary to state those amendments that were made already so that we don't have to backtrack that because there were amendments made to that section--

DELEGATE KAMENY: Yes, yes, I was waiting for the time to make mine.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: --and they were passed.

SECRETARY COOPER: The amendments that were made with respect to 3.2 were as follows. There was an amendment by Delegate Love to include that delegates must be sent copies of complete proposals using convention mail at least three calendar days before the first meeting and one calendar before the second and third meetings. That amendment was further amended by Delegate Schrag to insert the words "complete proposal and other relevant documents." And those are the only amendments that carried on 3.2.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: And that was the only thing we had. Mr. Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: I would like to move that at the beginning of the fourth line of Rule 3.2 that after the phrase "complete articles" we add "or subsections." And the reason for that is that we don't know at this point really what the whole composition and codification of the constitution is going to be in all instances. And we're not going to know what complete articles are. And, therefore, in many instances committees may well have a substantive proposal. We don't know if it's going to be an article. We don't know how it's going to fit in. But it's right for presentation

to the convention. And without that additional phrase the committees will be hog-tied, so to speak. And, therefore, I move that the phrase "or subsections" be added after the word "articles" on line four.

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly seconded to add the words "or subsections" after the word "articles" on line four of Rule 3.2. Is there any discussion on that? Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I rise to speak in opposition to this amendment. This matter was considered in the rules committee at not great length, but at some length. And it was the view of the committee that it would be better for complete articles to be reported. If you think about our 90-day limit, you'll see the reason for that, I think. The number of times we get reports for first reading from our committees will determine the number of days that we have to spend in plenary session in this particular aspect of convention work, first reading. If the committees are going to be reporting to us subsection by subsection, we won't get a chance to see when we're voting on a particular subsection how it relates to the other parts of that article that ultimately will be reported by that committee. It would be

better for the committees to wait until they have the--what may not ultimately be the whole article because it may be amended, but until they think that they have what they conceive to be the whole article. So that when it comes before us, we can see how the whole thing relates, how the different parts of that article relate to each other. And we don't have to sort of blindly guess what's going to still be coming from this committee at the time we vote on this. This is particularly important in view of the structure that we have devised for making it harder and harder to amend articles of a constitution as the thing goes along.

Therefore, since the first time is really a very important time--the first time we consider something is a very important time. It would be better for us to look at the entire article at that time and know what we're doing even if that means we may have to wait another week to get it. It's worth the wait for us to be able to get a complete article and be able to see how all the parts fit together.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Baldwin.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: Madam Chairperson, I decided to support what Delegate Schrag said in toto.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you. Anyone else?

Ms. Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I move the previous question.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The previous question has been moved. All those in favor of cutting off the debate let it be known by the sign of aye. [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Absentions? [No abstentions]

Ready for the vote on the amendment on Rule 3.2, line four: after the word "articles," "or subsections." That is what you are voting to add. All those in favor of Dr. Kameny's amendment let it be known by the sign of aye. [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

It was defeated.

Are there any other amendments to Section 3.2?

Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Madam Chair, I don't have an amendment, but I just do want to note one technical question. Last night when we passed Rule 6 of the Committee on Committees report, that report does have the words in it "or subdivision" when it talks about this subject. So, the

action we have just taken is in technical conflict with what we did last night. But that can be straightened out later by the committee on style and drafting as just a technical editing job. So, no amendment is necessary at this time.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Anyone else?

Gloria Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: In Rule 3.2 on the fifth line where it says "any." Replace that with "all." And on the next line, "report and minority views," insert the word "all" so it reads "report and all minority views."

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Ms. Corn, where are you, please?

DELEGATE CORN: Page 6.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: She's back on Rule 3.2 on page 6.

DELEGATE CORN: Fifth line.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Line 5 at the word "any."

DELEGATE CORN: Delete the word "any" and substitute in the word "all." on the next line add the word "all" before "minority views." And on page 7, on the fourth line, add the word "simple" before "majority." I think that's a clarification.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Are you offering that as an amendment?



DELEGATE CORN: Yes. I so amend. I so move.

SECRETARY COOPER: Would you state your amendment, please.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: "All" instead of the word "any," on the fifth line of Rule 3.2.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: What is the substantive change between "any" and "all"?

DELEGATE CORN: It's not substantive; it's a clarifying change.

A DELEGATE: It's an editing, a technical language editing, and it isn't required as an amendment. It is not required as an amendment because you are not modifying the sense.

DELEGATE CORN: No, I am just clarifying.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: There was no second to that. That was a recommendation going to the style and draft committee.

Mr. Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Move the previous question.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has already been moved. All those in favor of voting on Rule 3.2 as amended, let it be known by the sign of aye. [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

Okay, Rule 3.2, Mr. Secretary, was adopted.

Ms. Holmes, we are down to Rule 3.2.

Yes, Mr. Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Madam Chair, in terms of my vote, if we voted on what I think we voted on, I would like to change my vote. Were we voting on the entire Rule 3.2?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We did.

DELEGATE CROFT: Then I would like to change my vote from the negative to the affirmative. I thought we were voting on the amendment, which I think we've added a series of redundancies, but okay.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We thank you for joining us.  
Thank you.

Rule 3.3.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I make a motion that we adopt Rule 3.3, page 7, with the corrections and amendments if there be any.

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly seconded that we adopt Rule 3.3 on page 7 with the necessary amendments and correction.

Ms. Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Madam Chair, the parens which

exist in 3.3, the ninth line, see the parens that go: (to be decided by the convention on recommendation of the committee responsible for the calendar). My amendment is that we delete the parens and put a period of time, 10 to 30 minutes be set aside. And that would delete parens.

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Simmons, would you repeat your amendment so that the secretary--

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes, and I think the distinction that needs to be understood is in the first instance where there are those who are saying that maybe there should be some consistency, 5 to 30 minutes. In the first instance, that is a decision being made in the convention by the president, in the first instance. In this instance, this is the first reading of an article. And the first reading of an article is very--instead of spending time for the whole convention to recommend the amount of time, we've seen when the whole convention makes a decision that it's very much like a committee making--or a horse and ending up with a camel.

So, I'm suggesting that we specify the time. We always have the latitude to increase or lessen that amount by virtue of the body's authority. So, 10 to 30 minutes for the first reading would become the parens. A period of time,

10 to 30 minutes be set aside for the chair of the substantive committee to answer questions. These are questions on the article.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: That's 10 to 30 minutes--

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Right.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: --be set aside.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: See, you drop those parentheses.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: On line nine. And if you number your lines.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes, I initially said line nine. It's nine and ten. You strike "will," and then you take up the last word on line ten. And it has already been seconded.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Did everybody understand her amendment? Mr. Oulahan.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: I want to rise in opposition to it. I hate to take exception to my good friend Barbara Simmons, she has done such a good job. But I have to say here that when we get into the explanation of these articles of the constitution, particularly the bill of rights perhaps in addition here, a half-an-hour explanation by the chairman of the committee is not going to be sufficient. And I would urge my colleagues to leave the time open at the

present moment so that we can have a complete discussion of the matters which come up.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Simmons, would you write your amendment out for the secretary.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes, I will.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Gloria Corn had her hand up and then Long.

DELEGATE CORN: I would propose a substitute motion of no more than 1-1/2 hours. That would mean anywhere from five minutes up to and including an hour and a half. That seems sufficient time to cover the situation as Delegate Oulahan outlined it. There's no point every single time we reach a time limit to say, "Well, I want to extend it five more minutes." That just takes up another five minutes. So, I would say: of no more than 1-1/2 hours.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Do I hear a second to Ms. Corn's motion? Do I have a second to Ms. Corn's substitute motion?

A DELEGATE: Second.

SECRETARY COOPER: Put it in writing.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Would you write your motion out, please.

DELEGATE CORN: Yes, I will.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We have a substitute motion as made

by Ms. Corn, and she's writing it out to make sure that we have it precisely like she has made it.

DELEGATE CORN: It shall read--everything in the parenthesis I'm reading--of no more than 1-1/2 hours, one and a half hours.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You're saying not to delete what's there but add--

DELEGATE CORN: No, to delete what is there, everything in the parenthesis, and in its place put: of no more than 1-1/2 hours.

It has been moved and seconded. I call the question. [Laughter]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Wait just a minute [pounding table]. Did everybody understand her substitute as read? You would delete everything after the first paren on line nine and line ten at the end of the paren, and you would replace it with no more than one hour and a half. That is Ms. Corn's substitute motion. All those in favor of cutting off the discussion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

The substitute. All those in favor of her substitute motion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

It has lost. We are back to Ms. Simmons' amendment.

Ms. Street is the next. Mr. Long, I am sorry, then Ms. Street, and then Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE STREET: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: No, Mr. Long and then Ms. Street, in that order. I wrote it down. Mr. Long.

MR. LONG: The intention of the rules committee in the original phrasing was to allow for sections of the constitution--articles, I should say--which would require more or less questioning. That's why we didn't want to fix a period of time. But I guess it would be our committee on rules and calendars would itself, with the committee chair, from the committee writing the article, and get an estimate of what time was necessary for questions in that area. And then we could fix a period of time, and the body would then have that amount of time. If that proved too long and there weren't questions, you could stop. If it didn't prove long enough and there was a need, then it could be extended. But we wanted to have some idea of what we're into when it came to the floor. That was the intention of the original wording.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Ms. Street.

DELEGATE STREET: Madam Chair, I rise in support of the 10 to 30 minutes being sufficient to answer questions. If we note the following sentence, it says at the end of the question period, formal debate will begin. That is open. The time frame is open. And it seemed to me that is sufficient coverage of discussion of any particular amendments, the 10 to 30 minutes for question period, then the formal debate begins. And I highly approve of that.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I rise in support of the amendment because we do not want to be subject to the possibility of undue delays in this convention. But I also recognize the concerns of some delegates that for some articles, particularly the lengthy article on the legislature, that may not be enough time. And, therefore, I think that we can reach a compromise between these positions. And I suggest and move the following amendment to the Simmons amendment, have it read: of between 5 and 30 minutes, parenthesis, or such other amount of time as the convention, after recommendation by the rules committee, decides, close parenthesis.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Is there a second to the amendment



to the amendment?

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We have a second.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I understand from a brief conversation I had with Delegate Barbara Lett-Simmons that this amendment is looked on with favor by her.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I want to hear the language again. The language is different, I believe.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Okay, the language again. I can modify it if you have a problem with it.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Because one says 10 to 30 and one says 5.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: On first reading of an article, a period of time of between 5 and 30 minutes--so far it's the same as the Simmons amendment.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I said 10.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ten and 30 minutes.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I'm sorry, 10 and 30 minutes.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: And you're saying between 10 and 30?

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Same as hers so far. It is between 10 and 30 minutes. Parenthesis, or such other amounts of time as the convention, comma, after recommendation

by the--do you want to make it rules or executive?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: It'll have to be rules and calendar.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Rules and calendar committee.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Might the chair make a suggestion, that the two of you get together?

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Rules and calendar committee, comma, decides, close parenthesis.

As Delegate Lett-Simmons points out, this is a power the body has in any event, to extend time.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Correct.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: And this is merely specifying that for the--so that delegates can be assured that there will be some thought given to the amount of time that is necessary on an article-by-article basis. But the Lett-Simmons amendment is a good one because if the body takes no action in setting a time, then there will be between 10 and 30 minutes for a question period.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I believe that the amendment to the amendment is unnecessary, as indicated by Schrag, because what we're only talking about is clarification from the chair with regard to the article. We are not talking

about debate. And I can't believe that there can't be chairman clarification if there is thorough understanding of the work by the chair in response to questions. This is the only question. And I believe that, just as indicated, my thought is that the body always possesses the ultimate authority to increase time, to limit time. And this is implicit. I really do not see the need for the amendment to the amendment since it is a first reading and questions for clarification only. It is not the debate on that article. And debate itself we know is clarifying.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Delegate Schrag, did you have a second to your amendment to her amendment? I didn't hear any.

DELEGATE CORN: I seconded it.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Corn has seconded it.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Point of information.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Do you want to speak to his amendment to the amendment because it's before us?

DELEGATE HARRIS: Yes. Mr. Schrag, could you clarify for me why you think it is important for the recommendation to come from the rules and calendar committee.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I'm sorry, I do not think--that's a good question, Delegate Harris. And that is not an

important part of my motion. I'd be willing to withdraw the part that refers to the rules and calendar committee and let the body decide. I only put that in because that came from the rules committee, and I was supporting my Chairman Holmes and trying to support as much of the rules committee report as I could. But that's not essential to the concept here, which is that the body can decide. So, with the permission of the delegates assembled, I withdraw that part of my motion which refers to the rules and calendar committee and just leave or such other amount of time as the convention decides, close parenthesis. And I see Delegate Lett-Simmons shaking her head in the affirmative.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Would you bring your motion forward, please, to the secretary in writing.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Yes, I will.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, all those persons--

DELEGATE LONG: Point of information.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Who wants information? Mr. Long.

DELEGATE LONG: I would like to inquire of the parliamentarian or the chair whether during a question period, decision by the body to extend the time requires a simple majority or a two-thirds vote.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Two-thirds. It's two-thirds.

DELEGATE LONG: Even though it's not debate.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: That's right. Two-thirds.

We have before us Mr. Schrag's amendment to the amendment. The secretary will read it one more time before we vote on it.

SECRETARY COOPER: The new language of Mr. Schrag's amendment to Ms. Simmons' amendment to the main motion would include the language to say: of before 10 and 30 minutes--

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Of between, between.

SECRETARY COOPER: Between 10 and 30 minutes or such other amount of time as the convention decides.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Having heard that, ready for the vote. All those in favor of Mr. Schrag's amendment to Ms. Simmons' amendment, let it be known by the sign of aye.  
[Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [One abstention]

His amendment passed.

Now we are to Ms. Simmons. Have you passed in to him yours in writing so that he may read it?--because they do forget sometimes.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes.

SECRETARY COOPER: Ms. Simmons' amendment would

delete all of the language that is within parentheses beginning on line nine of Rule 3.3 and replace it with: from 10 to 30 minutes or such other time as--

DELEGATE SIMMONS: That's Delegate Schrag's. Mine is really the 10 to 30 minutes.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ten to 30 minutes.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Point of order. The Simmons amendment has been amended by the Schrag amendment, and now we vote on the amendment as amended.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, that's what he's reading.

Did you finish reading?

SECRETARY COOPER: It would delete all the information intended for...and replace it with: between 10 and 30 minutes or such other amount of time as the convention decides.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Or recommendation.

SECRETARY COOPER: Or recommendation.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Shelton.

DELEGATE SHELTON: I would believe, Madam Chair, that the Simmons amendment is no longer necessary because we actually took care of all of the conditions in the first amendment, the amendment to the amendment. And, therefore, it was not necessary for us now to vote on the Simmons

amendment. There is nothing new contained in that amendment not already provided for in the substitute.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The only other thing is that you would delete the parenthesis in yours, and it is not in that amendment from Mr. Schrag. And in order to do that, we do have to vote on it because that is a substantive change.

DELEGATE SHELTON: All right, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you. And we are really voting to delete the parenthesis and replace that language in there, all of that language on line nine and ten, and it would be replaced with: the 10 to 30 minutes. And it would also add Mr. Schrag's language that you've already voted on. And in order for us to do that, we have to now vote on that. And that's before us in Ms. Simmons' amendment, the deletion of the parenthesis and replacing that language, period.

Okay? Mr. Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCCHILD: I'd like to speak against that amendment and offer a substitute amendment. The reason I speak against it is there is no reason to specify the lower limit of 10 minutes. That's totally unnecessary. And an upper limit of half an hour I think is unrealistic. We have not even decided this point within half an hour. And we're much less likely to, with 45 delegates speaking to

the chair and asking questions, be able to do that in half an hour. So, I would suggest that it be an hour with no lower limit. And then if the convention is to reconsider the time at that point. But I think half an hour is only going to make us reconsider that so often that we are going to waste more time than it's actually going to save us. So, I would offer the substitute amendment of up to one hour, and then complete that with the language or as the convention wishes to decide.

DELEGATE CORN: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Now, what are you making, a substitute amendment?

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Yes. I just think in half an hour we don't do anything in half an hour.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: There can be no substitute amendment. I haven't heard that one before. You are making a substitute motion. And his deals with one hour. Will you put your motion in writing, but yours deals with one hour as opposed to--

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: All you have to do is change from 10 to 30--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I said yours deals with one hour as opposed to the 10 to 30 minutes. They just voted down



an hour and a half. Now yours deals with one hour. So that it's clear for everybody, he wants to substitute one hour for 10 to 30 minutes. And it has been duly seconded.

Ms. Simmons, Mr. Cassell, and Mr. Garner.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I rise to speak against the motion. While Delegate Rothschild may be making a comparative analysis of being consumed now with regard to a number of issues and items, I think he needs also to put into that equation the fact that when articles are before us and when chairpersons are presenting them, there will have been a great deal of deliberation which preceded it, and there will also have been the time for the expertise and the smoothness of the delegate body itself to function. That maturation and maturity and experience will innure to the benefit of a more expeditious kind of handling of our purpose. And I don't think you ought to fail to take that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: I think Delegate Simmons has made, you know, a very cogent point. I think that perhaps Delegate Rothschild has made a point, the lower limit need not be ten minutes. It can be anything, right? You don't have to hold this to ten minutes. But I think if we raise that to an hour, you're going to be obligated. I think people are

going to feel that they've got that hour to use; as Delegate Street indicated, that's only the question period. After that you've got plenty of time for the formal debate. If you allow half an hour for questions about the particular article or the subsections of the article, it should be plenty of time. If the convention feels that they need more time, they can easily extend that. I would not extend that to an hour. It doesn't matter what the lower limit is.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, you spoke against.

Mr. Garner.

MR. GARNER: I call the question.

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We have not allowed anyone to speak for. So, Ms. Corn, if you want to speak for the motion, you may speak.

DELEGATE CORN: I would support the motion. I don't think--

DELEGATE CROFT: Point of order, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: [Pounding table] I said--

DELEGATE CROFT: The question has been called.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: But we allowed two people to speak against and no one for. You passed in this body--

DELEGATE CROFT: Point of order, Madam Chair, point

of order. The motion to allow two speak for and two people to speak against was not a motion that was passed by this entire convention. It was a motion that was made to deal with one night.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: No, it was not.

DELEGATE CROFT: I would like that motion--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It was not. It was not. It was because of people calling the question, because everybody hadn't been heard on both sides, that that motion was made. But it did pass. So, in that spirit, Ms. Corn has the floor.

DELEGATE CORN: I speak for the motion. A limit of up to one hour does not mean necessarily that anyone is obligated of spending one hour. What it does mean is that each time an issue comes up or a committee comes before the group as a whole, we are not going to waste 25 minutes to trying to amend it from a half an hour to 45 minutes and then 45 minutes to an hour. I think that just the amount of time we're spending on this issue right now is indicative of the fact that by saying up to one hour, with the parenthesis of the Schrag amendment which has already passed, will allow us to save an awful lot of time over petty quibbling over extensions of five and ten and fifteen minutes. I move that you vote for--I ask you to vote for and support

the Rothschild amendment.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, anybody else to speak for--

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Point of order, Madam President. Madam Chairman, the last speaker, not anything she said was germane to what's before this house. We are not talking about amendments. We are talking about a question period by the chair on an article. That's very different.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Of one hour.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: We're not talking about amendments.

DELEGATE CORN: Of one hour.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: It speaks to debates.

DELEGATE CORN: I'm not talking about debates. I'm talking about the one hour questioning period of up to one hour.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: But you were talking about amendments. You don't have amendments to questions and answers.

DELEGATE CORN: I'm talking about if you set a limit of one half hour and then we felt it--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Corn and Ms. Simmons, let's not get into--

DELEGATE CORN: May I clarify my statements?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Please clarify so we can move along.

DELEGATE CORN: I feel that by saying that you have up to one half hour--

DELEGATE JONES: Madam Chairman, a point of order, Madam Chairman. Now, this has gone just a shade--Theresa Jones, Ward Eight. This has gone just a shade too far. If you are going to hold that the debate cannot be cut off, which I'm sure that it can be--but since you ruled it that way, I'm going to leave that alone. It seems to me that you would not let people come back and clarify and clarify us to death. That's an overkill. Now, if somebody else wants to debate on for or against or however he's doing that, I wish you would let them do that and let Ms. Corn stop.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: She or anyone else should have the right to clarify a statement if it is not understood by others.

DELEGATE CORN: Point of order.

DELEGATE JONES: The statement was understood.

DELEGATE CORN: I would like to make it absolutely clear for the record.

[Chairman Huff pounds table.]

DELEGATE CORN: I was interrupted three times--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Corn--

DELEGATE CORN: --while I was trying to make my point of why we should support the Rothschild motion.

DELEGATE JONES: A point of order, Madam Chairman--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay.

DELEGATE JONES: --to interrupt her a fourth time. I think you've let this go too far.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Well, you are entitled to your opinion.

Mr. Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: Madam Chairman, if it is in order, I would like to move the question.

DELEGATE CROFT: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The question has been moved and seconded. All those in favor of cutting off debate, let it be known by the sign of aye. [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

The motion carried.

We are now voting on Mr. Rothschild's substitute of one hour as opposed to--up to one hour as opposed to the language of 10 to 30 minutes.

DELEGATE CORN: It's up to one hour.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Now, ready for the vote. I said that, Ms. Corn. If you listened, you would have heard it. Ready for the vote. All those in favor of Mr. Rothschild's motion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

That lost.

We are down to Ms. Simmons and Mr. Schrag's amendment of up to 10 to 30 minutes and the deletion of the parenthesis in line nine and ten from the first paren to the second paren. All those in favor of the motion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

The motion carried.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: On the Rule 3.3, Madam Chair--  
[The Chairman pounds table to restore order.]

DELEGATE HARRIS: On Rule 3.3, line 18, I am moving to delete "brief germane amendments"--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Line 18 is the line just before

"orally," which is the last line. Everybody didn't number it.

DELEGATE HARRIS: I would like to move that we delete the sentence "Brief germane amendments to amendments may be proposed orally" because prior discussion and procedure for introducing amendments is sufficient, and we should discourage oral amendments being presented.

A DELEGATE: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: So, you want to strike that. Did everybody understand? It has been moved and seconded that we delete on line 18, right after "delegates": "Brief germane amendments to amendments may be proposed orally."

Is there any discussion? Mr. Rothschild and Mr. Kameny.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: I speak against that. I think it should be as it is written because I think there will be times that things will come up that will be brief and incidental to be amended. And I think it can be done orally. If we had to write everything out now that had just been done, we certainly wouldn't have done it in half an hour.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: We did it.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Yes, I speak against the



amendment. The language here says, "Brief germane amendments." There may well be amendments proposed which will represent welcome fine tuning in the language of what we already have, that sort of thing, which enhances our work product. It doesn't consume much time in general. And I think it's very well worthwhile. Otherwise you're cutting off a great deal of valuable input from the delegates and silencing people in a manner which I think is not terribly productive and can be counterproductive.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Anyone else, speaking for the amendment?

If there is no other discussion, ready for the vote on the deletion of, on line 18, after the word "delegates," period: "Brief germane amendments to amendments may be proposed orally" would be deleted.

All those in favor of striking that, let it be known by the sign of aye. [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [Three abstentions]

Would you please stand. All those in favor of striking on line 18 "Brief germane amendments to amendments may be proposed orally." All those in favor of striking this last sentence. Please stand. [Standing vote]

Okay, you may be seated.

All those opposed to striking the last line,  
please stand. [Standing vote]

Okay, you may be seated.

Any abstentions? [Three abstentions]

Okay, 22 for; 14 opposed; and three abstentions.  
That sentence will be deleted.

Ms. Holmes.

DELEGATE CORN: No, wait a minute.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: One amendment.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Fourth line from the bottom:  
"before that committee reported the article for the first  
reading," I would delete that so that it reads: "On second  
reading, an amendment shall be in order only if (1) it has  
been introduced, in substance, for the substantive committee's  
consideration. I don't see the necessity to have introduced  
it before the first reading because after the first reading--  
supposing you reading something through you find something  
else or you find it doesn't work for some reason or re-see it  
in a new light, then if you have not introduced that  
amendment prior to the first reading, you're locked in, the

way this reads now. Therefore, I propose the deletion of: "before that committee reported the article for first reading," that you're not locked into decisions before the first reading. What is the point of a second reading if you can't introduce something after the first reading? It seems pointless that you have a second reading. I therefore move that the amendment to 3.3--that the following words be deleted--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Which line?

DELEGATE CORN: The fourth line from the bottom, the following words be deleted: "before that committee reported the article for first reading."

DELEGATE KAMENY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: That's on line 16, no 15. That's 15, line 15.

DELEGATE CORN: Thirteen and 16.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Line 15.

DELEGATE CORN: Line 13 and 16, that the following language be stricken: "before that committee reported the article for first reading." Otherwise there is no point of a second reading or a third reading.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Style and drafting might mandate you have--

DELEGATE CORN: I think this is very critical so

that if any brilliant ideas come up--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Someone did second your--Ms. Corn, someone did second your--who seconded Ms. Corn's motion?

SECRETARY COOPER: Mr. Kameny.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Kameny, okay. It has been properly seconded. Is there any discussion on this deletion?

Ms. Simmons, Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I'd just like to make a point of clarification. My understanding of Delegate Harris's amendment and the deletion was to eliminate the oral amendments. What we know is that Robert's Rules prevail. We will always have opportunity to write a brief amendment. And so I believe that what Delegate Corn is failing to appreciate are those two facts. And, therefore, the interpretation that she has that it becomes a moot point after the first reading just simply is not the facts of the matter.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I speak in opposition to the Corn amendment and its support of the rules committee report. The purpose of the language in the rules committee report is to give the substantive committees first crack at all important amendments. And anything being introduced at the time of second reading is obviously something of great

importance. This rules committee report as written gives the substantive committee the opportunity to have considered this matter beforehand. And the protection, in case it overlooks something, the protection for permitting this to be brought up at second reading even if it hadn't been considered beforehand is in the section...unless this requirement is waived by the committee chair. That means that the committee chair may permit in his or her discretion the amendment to be brought up on second reading even though it wasn't given to the committee prior to first reading. So that if the committee has overlooked something--and it's appropriate to bring it up at second reading--it can still be done so by virtue of permission from the committee chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you, Mr. Schrag.

Mr. Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: I hesitate to speak in favor of it because it'll probably lose for that reason alone.

[Laughter]

But, nevertheless, I do speak in favor of the amendment proposed by Ms. Corn because I do feel that there's going to be so much happening at that latter part of our convention that it's quite possible that we will not be able to keep up as quickly as the events will be happening. And

I think we are closing out the possibility for input. And I think at that point we should not close out to that extent the possibility for input. So, I therefore speak in favor of the motion.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Street, you had your hand up; you had a question?

DELEGATE STREET: Yes, I have a question to ask the committee. Was there any consideration for time for the style and drafting committee to redo the article prior to the second reading?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: They can't change the substance, Vicky.

DELEGATE STREET: No, I'm sure they can't. But in the event there might be some changes, the second reading is the final reading; is there a third reading?

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Only sometimes.

DELEGATE STREET: I don't see the provision for it.

It's in 3.4, oh, yes, okay. Style and drafting is included, okay.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, in 3.4.

Ms. Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: I'd like to defend something that Delegate Schrag said. He said to delete this is unimportant

or in essence it's not necessary because this requirement can be waived by the committee chair. I don't want to place that much power in the hands of committee chair. Committee chairmanship may be obtained by someone not by virtue of their superior intelligence or capability or knowledge of that field, but won by a political decision by this body. I speak against what Philip Schrag said because I don't think it should be left to the discretion of the committee chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, thank you, Ms. Corn. Now having heard--ready for the vote, ready for the vote on striking "before that committee reported the article for the first reading." All of those in favor of Ms. Corn's motion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

The motion lost.

Back to Ms. Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I move--[the chairman pounds table to restore order]--that we would move the whole section after we do Rule 3.4 at the adoptions--I mean, after the--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: No, no, no. Let's deal with Rule 3.3.

DELEGATE HOLMES: 3.4.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: 3.3, so whoever is in this chair won't have to go backward--3.3 as amended.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I second.

DELEGATE HOLMES: I move that we take 3.3.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: And Ms. Simmons seconded. Now, all those in favor of adopting Rule 3.3 as amended, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

[The motion to adopt Rule 3.3 as amended carried.]

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I move that we adopt 3.4 with all the corrections and amendments if there be any.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Is there a second?

DELEGATE BLOUNT: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been properly moved that Rule 3.4 be adopted with any necessary amendments. It was seconded. Mr. Blount seconded it.

Mr. Oulahan.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Courts Oulahan, Ward Three. Madam Chair, I move the following addition at the end of Section 3.4. Within ten days after the constitution has



been approved, any delegate may submit in writing to the secretary a comment upon or a dissent from one or more provisions of the constitution, which comment or dissent shall become a part of the records of the convention.

I'm moving this because in the last days of constitutions, I understand, a lot of things happen when, after the heat of the debate and the constitution is approved, we go and read it over, there may be some points, particular points, which we individually have substantial reservations about even though you might sign a constitution. And, being a great dissenter, I just want to be sure that the right to comment and dissent exists and that if we submit this in writing within ten days, it will become a part of the written record to which you can refer later on to your grandchildren and children and say, "Look, this was my contribution." Thank you.

DELEGATE CORN: Madam Chairman, I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and seconded that we add it in, and I think everybody heard it. So, I don't think we have to read it anymore, hopefully. That within ten days after the constitution has been written--

A DELEGATE: Approved.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: --and approved--well, I'm reading what Mr. Oulahan passed up here in writing.

A DELEGATE: Would you read it again, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Add to the end: Within ten days after the constitution has been written or has been approved, any delegate may submit in writing to the secretary a written comment upon a dissent from one or more provisions of the constitution, which comment or dissent shall become a part of the record of the convention.

Is there any discussion?

Ms. Simmons, Mr. Cassell, Ms. Harris, and Mr. Moore.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Point of information. I guess my point of inquiry is really to the parliamentarian. Is it not a part of the legislative history of all such documents and legislation that what you propose, Delegate Oulahan, obtains?

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Madam Chair, to clarify my good friend, I want to make part of the legislative history here in our rule a provision that what would ordinarily be part of the legislative history will be part of the legislative history. There will be no question about it if this rule is adopted.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Mr. Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: My question has been answered.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Blount and Mr. Moore.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: Delegate Blount, Ward Seven.

If this motion passes, a front would be presented to the public that would not be a united front because it seems to me it would end up sort of like a minority report after the constitution has been accepted. So, I would urge the defeat of this motion because all dissension should be displayed before the constitution is adopted. Once the constitution is adopted, I would think that all delegates would be fully and vigorously in support of the constitution in all the areas of the city and the Congress.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Talmadge Moore.

MR. T. MOORE: I'll waive it now.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, you want to pass. Any other comments? Ms. Eichhorn.

DELEGATE EICHORN: Janice Eichhorn, Ward Six. I would just like to suggest that I think what Delegate Oulahan is addressing, Delegate Blount, is the possibility that a convention delegate would support the constitution as a whole in spite of a problem with a part of it, but would want the problem with that part of it to be on the

record. And this provision might allow delegates to support the constitution as a whole while expressing a minor reservation. And I wonder if Oulahan could clarify that. Was that your intention?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Oulahan, a question has been raised to you. Would you please...

DELEGATE OULAHAN: I have to say that my hearing isn't very good tonight, and the acoustics are great. But let me again repeat my proposal. My proposal is to permit those of us who are so minded, within ten days before the record of the constitution is closed, to submit in writing such statements or comments that they may choose or want to make to add to the legislative history. As I say, there may be one provision in that constitution which any one of us may say, "How did I allow that to go through? I can't live with it." Just put your dissent in, and it's a matter of record. That doesn't mean that the person hasn't supported the constitution; you're making a matter of record what you think. And I would hope that this constitutional record will be one in which all comment, all dissent, all majority views, all minority views of any kind or nature whatsoever will be spread upon the record. That's what I think the people of the District of Columbia would want.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Mr. Baldwin.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: When is the record of the convention closed, prior to the affixing of the signatures of the delegates on it? Are you speaking of ten days after that? What is meant by the closing of the record on the constitution?

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Madam Chair, I'm using a legal and judicial term. When we get through a hearing, many times a hearing officer or judge will say, "I'll give you ten days to put your documents in, at which time the record would close." I used it as a figure of speech.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: But I don't think it really applies. And if it does, you still haven't answered the question. Does it close prior to the affixing of the signatures on that constitution, or are you saying ten days after that? I think if you could clear that up, then I would know how to vote on your amendment.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Madam Chair, I'm very glad to clear it up. Under my proposal, the record would not be closed until ten days after the constitution had been signed. The record which would not close would consist of the comments which I have described.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Ms. Jones.

DELEGATE JONES: Yes, Theresa Jones from Ward Eight. I urge that we vote this down, and the reason for my urging that we vote it down is just giving the sentence out or way to disrespect the vote. Now, the problem that I--also the problem that I'm having with it, because there's some people who ran on political platforms in here who are not supporters of statehood. And I don't think that people ought to have that kind of out because there has been every opportunity given to people to dissent. And all of it has gone into the record. And I think that if you want your dissent to go into the record, you put it into the record at that time. And if you're really out to promote yourself to get on a TV program or in the Washington Post as not supporting the constitution after you signed it, then you use that out. And I urge that you vote it down.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Street's hand was next; following that, Ms. Harris.

DELEGATE STREET: I would hope that in no way we have the impression that minority reports will not be a part of the record. Minority reports will be a part of the record. Is that not our agreement?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You voted on that already.

DELEGATE STREET: I see no need then for a post

morton.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: I'd like to agree in part with Delegate Oulahan, and that is substatements and reports will be included in the constitution. But the part I had very serious problems with is that ten days afterwards to include these statements. It seems to me the appropriate time is during the discussion. If you have very serious problems with what is being voted on or discussed, that you make your wishes known and attach it to the minutes of that particular day. But I do have problems with waiting until ten days after, and I think it will cause very serious problems for people who have afterthoughts and might want to include things that were not really germane to the main discussion.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Mr. Garner and Mr. Robinson. Garner, Robinson, and then Rothschild.

DELEGATE GARNER: I would like to speak in favor of the motion of Delegate Oulahan. I think we are in agreement on the fact that minority views should be part of the record in the debate. I think we should be very aware that some of us, one ward, we have a political problem. There was opposition of a substantial nature to the statehood



initiative. Delegate Oulahan and others of us in Ward Three need to do as much as we can to get as many people to support this constitution as we can. What I believe he is proposing--and I urge you to take it, and I believe this is good advice--one way all of us who have been active in this and those of us, specifically myself, who have been strong statehood supporters, it will be easier for us to go to our constituents and urge them to vote for the document even if they or we say, "I wouldn't have written that provision necessarily that way, but the document as a whole deserves to be supported."

His provision gives us that political leverage. It's important for us to be able to do this. And I think the bottom line is how to get the most votes for the document we are all going to agree to. His motion, I believe, is a pro-statehood position and it's one that I urge you to support.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you. Mr. Robinson.

DELEGATE ROBINSON: Madam Chairman, I call the previous question.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The previous question has been called. All those in favor of cutting off debate, let it be



known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

The debate is cut off.

We are back to Mr. Oulahan's amendment to Rule 3.4 of the rules committee's report. Ready for the vote. All those in favor of Mr. Oulahan's addition at the end of Rule 3.4, as you have heard it read, let it be known by standing. [Standing vote]

DELEGATE CORN: Ward Three.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: All those opposed, please stand.  
[Standing vote]

You may be seated.

The vote is 32 against--

DELEGATE KAMENY: Abstentions!

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I'm sorry. Abstentions. [Two abstentions]

Now I know you'll wait. One abstention. The vote is 32 against--Ms. Corn; four for; one abstention.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Two abstentions, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Two abstentions? Will the abstentions stand. I only saw Dr. Kameny--[Delegates Kameny and Schrag stand]--and Mr. Schrag. Two abstentions.

Thirty-two against, four for, and two abstentions.  
Now, that lost.

Mr. Long.

DELEGATE LONG: I move we recess until 8:00 o'clock.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We have not adopted Rule 3.4.

A DELEGATE: Withdraw your motion, Wes, until we  
adopt 3.4.

DELEGATE LONG: I withdraw.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I move that we--  
[the chairman pounds table to restore order]--adopt Rule 3.4  
with the amendments.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I know that politicking is impor-  
tant, but pay attention.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly  
seconded that Rule 3.4 with the amendments be adopted.  
Ready for the vote.

DELEGATE CROFT: Call the previous question.

DELEGATE STREET: I've been standing. I want  
recognition. I have another amendment before the adoption.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Ms. Street.

DELEGATE STREET: I move that lines 11, 12, and 13 be amended to read: The constitution shall be approved only if it receives the affirmative votes of a quorum of the delegates sitting. And I offer that in substitution for the part that says at least 23 delegates.

A DELEGATE: Could you explain what you mean, Delegate Street?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: May we have your motion in writing.

Do I hear a second to her motion? Do I hear a second to the motion?

DELEGATE JONES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Street, do you have--

DELEGATE STREET: I'm writing it now.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Will you repeat it so that any discussion needs to take place [pounding table to restore order]. We are going to have Ms. Street to restate her motion so that you can vote it up or down, please, after discussion.

SECRETARY COOPER: I don't know whether she received a second or not.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, Ms. Jones seconded her motion.

SECRETARY COOPER: I'm sorry.

DELEGATE STREET: Delegates--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Please listen [pounding table].

DELEGATE STREET: I would amend that to say a majority of the delegates sitting rather than a quorum. And the reason is Madam Chairman has reminded me of what we had already voted. Would you state that again, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You voted on a quorum of 23, I believe it is.

DELEGATE STREET: That's right.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: And that is a quorum to take care of the business of the convention. This will be changing your quorum.

DELEGATE STREET: Then the sense of my motion will be the majority of the delegates sitting.

A DELEGATE: What does that mean, sitting?

A DELEGATE: What do you mean by sitting?

DELEGATE STREET: Present at the time, a majority of the delegates present.

DELEGATE COATES: Madam Chairlady.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Coates and Ms. Shelton and Mr. Love.

DELEGATE COATES: If I understand correctly the

proposed amendment, it would allow that the constitution might be adopted by less than a majority of the delegates, a quorum being 23, a majority of 23. It would be considerably much less than 23 of course. It could be as few as 12 persons adopting the constitution. That is at best the worst kind of consideration on our part, and I would strongly urge that we informally withdraw the amendment and, if not, that we vote no as a position. Reject the amendment.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay.

DELEGATE KAMENY: I think it's crucially important in terms of presenting the constitution to the community that we be able to say that it is a majority of the whole convention and not something it can be argued to be a minority of the convention but just accidentally a majority of the people voting. Therefore, I would urge that this amendment be voted down.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, anybody else? Mr. Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Call the previous question.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The previous question has been called. All those ready to cut off debate let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed?

DELEGATE JOHNSON: [Alone] Nay. Oh.

[Delegates laugh.]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Ms. Johnson is with us.

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

All those in favor of Ms. Street's amendment, let  
it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Response]

Abstentions? [One abstention]

The motion carried--

SECRETARY COOPER: Failed.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Failed. The motion failed,  
failed. One abstention.

Now we are back to the motion of Rule 3.4 as made  
by Ms. Holmes to be adopted with the amendments that have  
passed in toto. And it was properly seconded. Ready for the  
vote. All those in favor, signify by saying, "Aye."  
[Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

That carried.

Mr. Wesley Long has the floor.

DELEGATE LONG: I move that we recess for 15  
minutes.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved--

DELEGATE COATES: Point of order, Madam Chairlady.

A DELEGATE: It requires two-thirds.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It requires a two-thirds vote.

That's reconsidering the time previously set, and it has been properly seconded. Ready for the vote. All those in favor of recessing for ten minutes as made--

SECRETARY COOPER: Fifteen, 15.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Oh, 15 minutes. You changed it. Fifteen minutes.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: That is a violation of what we previously said.

A DELEGATE: The time has already been fixed at the last meeting.

DELEGATE LONG: Ten minutes.

SECRETARY COOPER: Ten, he said ten.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It calls for a two-thirds vote.

All those in favor of Mr. Long's motion which deal with the ten-minute recess, which requires a two-thirds vote, let it be known by standing. [Standing vote]

Okay, you may be seated.

All those opposed, please stand. [Standing vote]

You may be seated.

Abstentions? [One abstention]

The vote is 22 for, 16 against, and one abstention. That is not two-thirds. That is not two-thirds; we will continue.

The floor is now open for the next order of business, which will be the election. So that we can do the election in an organized fashion, we have a blackboard over here. I am going to ask Mr. Lawson if he will help us there. Ms. Morris, if you don't mind. Ms. Irene Morris, will you come up here. Need a little help.

Now, I am going to ask that every delegate be seated in your seats.

Will all of the delegates come inside. The hour is approaching.

Okay, we are going on without you because you voted not to have a recess. So, we are going to go on with the business. I am going to ask that all of the delegates be seated. Ms. Corn, I am going to ask that you refrain from your remarks and anybody else. And if you haven't done your politicking by now...

We will proceed with the election of officers. So, if you would please be seated. Mr. Cassell, would you take your seat.



According to the rules that you have adopted, the officers of the convention shall be the president, the first vice president, the second vice president, a third vice president, a secretary, assistant secretary, a treasurer, and a historian.

Now, I am going to ask, would you like to start with the office of the president or would you like to start from the bottom up? [Simultaneous comments]

Wait just a minute. Just a minute. I am asking for this body--Ms. Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: I move that the nominations now be open, the floor be open for nominations for the office of president of the Statehood Constitutionnal Convention.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly seconded that the office of president be first to be elected. Is there any discussion on that?

Mr. Long.

DELEGATE LONG: I think I'd like to make a couple of preliminary remarks. The election of the leadership of the convention is a crucial moment in the convention, especially for the president of the convention. And I'm

concerned that we do not let the results of this election, whatever it may be, affect continuance of cooperation throughout the rest of the convention. [Applause]

I personally pledge my support to whoever is elected. I am not a candidate for any office. I personally pledge my support to whoever is elected as the leadership of this convention, to put my back into the work of the convention to make it go forward. Our purpose here--the reason I was elected--was to write a constitution, not to run for office, not to politick--except for candidates I approve of. [Delegates laugh.]

Peace is what I hope for after this is over.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Mr. Long. Ms. Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Madam Chair, I think there is a motion on the floor to elect the president first and then move on. And I don't think that motion has been carried, if I understand it right.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been seconded that we start with the president first. It was asked by me of some of the delegates would you start at the bottom. That is an option. So, someone had the motion on the floor that we elect a president first. That's the motion. Now, anybody want to speak to it?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes, Madam Chairman. Unless the body wants to do something contrary to that, that is the natural order of things.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Yes, I understand that. But since the motion is before us, all those in favor of the motion, let it be known by saying, "Aye." [Response]

Those opposed? [Silence]

Abstentions? [No abstentions]

That is the ordinary procedure. The president is the first office that will be elected. The floor is now open for nominations. Ms. Chestie Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Madam Chairperson, do we just name the person or do we make speeches or how is it to be done?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You've got to name the person before you can make a speech for them. Come on, you have the floor.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Madam Chairman and members of this delegation and citizens: We are approaching writing a constitution for a state in which we live. However, we call it a city now. All of us have been elected delegates, and we have a great responsibility. Our main goal is to write a constitution. However, we do need somebody to chair

what is to be done and to do the other things that we have already voted upon. I'm going to nominate a delegate for the position as president. This person has worked in the community. She is interested in all aspects I think of human beings living better, being educated, and having good housing and what not. I could go on talking about the person for a very long time. But I don't think we need to do that tonight.

I will place in nomination without further ado the name of council member Hilda Mason. And I hope you will support me in voting for her.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The name of Councilwoman Hilda Mason has been placed in nomination. Are there any other nominations? Mr. Robinson's hand is up.

DELEGATE ROBINSON: Madam Chairman, members of this delegation--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Don't preach now. Just make the nomination, Brother. [Delegates laugh.]

DELEGATE ROBINSON: I stand before you tonight to place into nomination the name of Mr. Charles Cassell, a man who I believe can lead us, unify us, take us through the difficult times that the very process of statehood will demand, a man who has served the city as an elected member

of the school board, a man who now serves this city on the staff of the University of the District of Columbia, a man whose history is rooted in statehood. I can stand here for the next 15 minutes--I could stand here for the next 15 minutes and read off his credentials. But I ask only one thing of you, that tonight that you think in terms of the long stretch, that you think in terms not only of tonight, but of everything that we must do as 45 elected persons in making statehood a reality. And I believe that if you are honest to the very depths of your heart, you will vote affirmatively for Charles Cassell. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you, Mr. Robinson.

Are there any other nominations for the position of president? Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations for the position of president?

Having heard none, you may now--

DELEGATE CROFT: "Having heard none" is being corrected. I move that the nominations be closed.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Do I hear a second?

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: It has been moved and properly seconded that the nominations be closed on the two names. Now, before you vote, I would assume that you would like to

hear from these two people.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I was just going to ask you if seconding speeches are in order.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: That's up to this body.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Yes.

DELEGATE T. MOORE: I wanted to know, is there any limitation on the time element on the subject?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Well, two minutes. You ought to be able to say it in two minutes. Okay?

Are we going to hear from the candidates first?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Seconding.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You want to make a seconding speech?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: You have the floor. Two minutes.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Fellow delegates, I believe that what we are about to embark upon is a terribly significant act in behalf of those who have placed their public trust and confidence in us. I have every confidence that each of the nominees on that board are people with long history of interest in statehood. I think that each is a very high calibre, competent person. I will be casting my ballot for Mr. Cassell because I stated early on in our

Ninth Ward meeting to Councilwoman Mason, whom I have known for many, many years and feel some responsibility for her being in the political arena initially, I pointed out to her that I would honor the suggestion that no public elected official serve as the chair of this convention, this delegation. And it is for that reason I did think that it should be a person who had the responsibility, the responsiveness, and the obligation to be sensitive to the total city. Charles Cassell is the only member of the Ninth Ward who fulfills all of those requirements, and it is for those reasons, accompanied with unquestioned belief that his sophistication, his deep interest in the success of this, demonstrated by his long years of support of statehood, that he will make every effort to see that the total city is well represented in a creditable document.

SECRETARY COOPER: Time.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Thank you. Are there any other seconding speeches for either candidate? Seconding speeches for either candidate? Ms. Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Corn, Ward Three. I think the reason--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Please, please [addressing

delegates out of order].

DELEGATE CORN: --the reason it was stated that we were going to have open elections was so that we would be bound to our constituencies to represent their point of view. If all of you had done what I did, you would be bound to Hilda Mason. I went through every precinct in my ward and of those two candidates--certainly both are very well qualified, both are eminent individuals, both have done tremendous amounts for the District and both have done tremendous amounts to bring this convention together to begin with. But if you are in fact representing your constituents, you must vote for the one that came in with a higher vote count in every precinct in your ward, and that person is Hilda Mason. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, thank you. Are there any other seconding speeches? Are there any other seconding speeches? Any other seconding speeches?

Having heard none, that's the end of the seconding speeches. Now, the candidates. We have Mr. Cassell and Ms. Mason. Ms. Mason is number one. Would you like to speak to this body?

DELEGATE MASON: Good evening to all of the delegates here. I appreciate the fact that my name has been



placed in nomination to serve as the president of the convention. Many of know my history. In 1971 I was elected to the board of education and served there 5-1/2 years, with the help of a lot of people here, including Barbara Simmons. Before that I had worked in the school system 19 years. After that I took the place of Julius Hobson on the council and have served there ever since. I belong to almost every group you can name in this District of Columbia and almost in the United States, especially in connection with women's civil rights and all the other human rights groups. I'm sure that you know my record, that if I am president, I will work well with all of the people here. And the quality of my work will be good and of high quality. I'm sure you know that. And I have been involved with the statehood movement since the beginning of the Statehood Party. I went all through the initiative period, all through the 51st State period when we were planning for the convention. And now I am here helping to facilitate and to support getting this constitution before the residents of the District of Columbia. I pledge you everything that I have, as I have done in all of the efforts that I have put forth in whatever I have done. And I hope that you will support me tonight. Thank you very much. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Number two, Mr. Charles Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: Fellow delegates, this is perhaps the first time that Hilda Mason and I have found ourselves on the opposite side of any issue. I want to make it very clear that we are not opponents and we are not antagonistic. As a matter of fact, when we were on the school board, there were many times that the two of us were a minority of people who were trying to fight for equality and struggled for the representation of the citizens of Washington, D.C., using that board as the only elective body then to do things that needed to be done.

I want to repeat what others have said. That is however this election turns out, that I intend to support the president and work with that president. And I hope that we all will do what we have committed ourselves to do.

I find it rather difficult to talk about myself. I'm usually talking about issues and so forth. One of the most important things in Washington, D.C. is that for a hundred years they've been struggling for equality. And we've dealt with home rule, with self-determination. There's a voting rights amendment before the Congress now or before the people. This I think is the first opportunity we have to really achieve parity and equity with other people. I've

been involved in that essentially since the very beginning. Many of us were involved in the struggle to get some kind of representative government. The Statehood Party has perhaps been the happiest thing and the most successful thing that has happened. And I was a lieutenant of Julius Hobson, and I learned much of my fighting, much of my ability to challenge and ability to develop support from Julius Hobson. I was one of the founders of the statehood movement, one of the founders of the Statehood Party. Of course each election that has happened since then I've been a part of, essentially to push the statehood movement.

I would hope that we can all pull together to create a very concise and effective document which will receive the support of the electorate and then, using them as our constituents, receive the support of the Congress. I really feel we should go for the passage of it. I pledge myself as the president of this organization or simply as a member that I'll work as hard and as effectively as I have before. I thank you very much for the nomination--

SECRETARY COOPER: Time.

DELEGATE CASSELL: --and I thank you for your votes if I happen to be elected. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Okay, Ms. Nahikian.

DELEGATE NAHIKIAN: Madam Chairman, a point of information. For myself and for other delegates that may be interested, would you please just review briefly the rules that will be used in voting now that we are ready for the vote. It is by roll call?

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I was getting ready to tell you that.

DELEGATE NAHIKIAN: And I was just wondering, are there other rules? Are delegates allowed to pass and come back and vote before the end? Are delegates allowed to abstain and come back and vote again? I'd just like for that to be established.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: We will do this, if there is no objection, by roll call.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Madam Chairman, I move the election.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I think it's important that people understand what we--and I am answering her question. And her question was how we were going to do this. And I'm responding to that, that we are going to do the election by roll call. If you should happen to pass and the secretary gets through and you have not voted, he can come back to you.

SECRETARY COOPER: Only passes.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Only passes.

DELEGATE NAHIKIAN: Thank you. That's all I wanted to know.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Is that understood?

A DELEGATE: Yes, right.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Now, Mr. Cooper, will you please call the roll.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: The first name is Ms. Hilda Mason, and he is going to call the roll. Name the candidate.

DELEGATE CROFT: Madam Chair.

A DELEGATE: You can name the candidate.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Saves time.

DELEGATE CROFT: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HUFF: Mr. Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Wouldn't it be in order that when you call the roll that the delegate states who they're voting for rather than--

CHAIRMAN HUFF: I said to call the name of the candidates.

DELEGATE CROFT: Thank you.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Baldwin.

DELEGATE BALDWIN: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Barnes.  
DELEGATE BARNES: Charles Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Blount.  
DELEGATE BLOUNT: Charles Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Bruning.  
DELEGATE BRUNING: Hilda Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Cassell.  
DELEGATE CASSELL: Charles Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Coates.  
DELEGATE COATES: Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Cooper. Cassell.  
Delegate Corn.  
DELEGATE CORN: Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Croft.  
DELEGATE CROFT: Charles Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Eichhorn.  
DELEGATE EICHORN: Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Feely.  
DELEGATE FEELY: Delegate Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Freeman.  
DELEGATE FREEMAN: Delegate Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Garner.  
DELEGATE GARNER: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jackson.

DELEGATE JACKSON: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Delegate Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jones.

DELEGATE JONES: Delegate Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jordan.

DELEGATE JORDAN: Charles Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Hilda Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Lockridge.

DELEGATE LOCKRIDGE: Delegate Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Long.

DELEGATE LONG: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Love.

DELEGATE LOVE: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Marcus.  
DELEGATE MARCUS: Delegate Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Charles Mason.  
DELEGATE C. MASON: Delegate Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Hilda Mason.  
DELEGATE H. MASON: Delegate Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Brian Moore.  
DELEGATE B. MOORE: Delegate Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Jerry Moore.  
DELEGATE J. MOORE: Hilda Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Talmadge Moore.  
DELEGATE T. MOORE: Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Nahikian.  
DELEGATE NAHIKIAN: Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Nixon.  
DELEGATE NIXON: Pass.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Oulahan.  
DELEGATE OULAHAN: Mason.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Paramore.  
DELEGATE PARAMORE: Cassell.  
SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Robinson.  
DELEGATE ROBINSON: Cassell.



SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Shelton.

DELEGATE SHELTON: Mason.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Delegate Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Street.

DELEGATE STREET: Delegate Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Terrell.

DELEGATE TERRELL: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Pass.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Warren.

DELEGATE WARREN: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Nixon.

DELEGATE NIXON: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Cassell.

SECRETARY COOPER: The count is as follows.

Delegate Hilda Mason, 21 votes. Delegate Charles Cassell,  
our newly elected president, 23 votes. [Applause]